

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Regarding Section 1 of the office action, with respect to the Information Disclosure Statement of April 14, 2005, all cited references were cited in the International Search Report (ISR), which issued by the JPO. Such references are made available to the U.S. examiner in the national stage application, pursuant to MPEP 1893.03(g), and therefore copies of such art need not be submitted by the Applicants.

Regarding Section 2 of the office action, with respect to the Information Disclosure Statement of November 1, 2007, attached is a copy of a PTO date-stamped acknowledgment indicating receipt of the nine documents cited on the PTO-1449.

Accordingly, an indication of consideration of the references of the above-discussed Information Disclosure Statements is deemed to be warranted and is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9 have been amended, and claims 10 and 11 have been newly added. Support for the amendments is provided at least in the specification on page 18, lines 8-11 and 18-21, page 21, line 24, through page 23, line 23, and page 24, line 9, through page 25, line 24.

Claims 1, 5, and 9 were rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Wada et al. (US 7,130,290) in view of Nakatsugawa et al. (US 7,136,365). Claims 2 and 3 were rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Wada in view of Nakatsugawa, Perkins et al. (IP Mobility Support article), and Narten et al. (Neighbor Discovery for IP Version 6 (IPv6) article). Claim 4 was rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Wada in view of Nakatsugawa and Ayerst et al. (US 5,799,012). Claim 6 was rejected, under 35 USC

§103(a), as being unpatentable over Wada in view of Nakatsugawa, Pannell et al. (US 6,208,644) and Inoue (US 6,925,087). Claim 7 was rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Wada in view of Nakatsugawa, Pannell, Inoue, and La Porta et al. (US 6,496,505). Claim 8 was rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Wada in view of Nakatsugawa and La Porta. To the extent these rejections may be deemed applicable to the amended claims, the Applicants respectfully traverse based on the points set forth below.

Claim 1 now defines a network element apparatus that creates a message containing a unique global address assigned to a network element apparatus, a temporarily assigned global address of the network element apparatus, and a global address of a higher-level router to which the network element apparatus is connected. The claimed subject matter allows the network element to pass the global address of the higher-level router to the network element's home agent or corresponding nodes (see specification page 9, lines 20-24). Thus, a home agent or corresponding nodes may construct a routing header for sending packets directly to the network element (see page 9, line 24, through page 10, line 1).

The Office Action acknowledges that Wada does not disclose the above-mentioned feature of claim 1 (see Office Action page 4, third paragraph). To overcome this deficiency, the Office Action proposes that Nakatsugawa discloses a message containing a unique global address, a temporarily assigned global address, and a global address of a router indicating a location of a network element apparatus in a global network (see page 4, lines 1-7).

However, Nakatsugawa discloses that a router R2 judges that a packet, including a care-of address (CoA) of a mobile node transmitted from a home agent, is transmitted to router R2

because the destination of the packet is router R2 (see Nakatsugawa col. 15, lines 40-52). That is, the address of the router is the destination of the packet.

The Applicants respectfully submit that it necessarily follows that Nakatsugawa does not disclose transmitting the CoA of the mobile node and the address of the higher level router in association with each other in the same message, because the destination of the packet including the CoA of the mobile node is the router.

Claim 1 recites an association of a CoA of a network element apparatus and the address of a higher level router to which the network element apparatus is connected, and this technical concept cannot be derived from the combination of Wada and Nakatsugawa. By transmitting the above-described association to a network entity that communicates with the network element apparatus, it is possible to register an entry of the association of a unique global address, which is a home address of the network element apparatus, a temporarily assigned address, which is a CoA, and a global address of the higher level router (unique global address, a temporarily assigned global address and a global address of a router) in the network entity that communicates with the network element apparatus. As described in the specification, such an entry makes it possible to increase the efficiency of packet delivery (see specification page 9, line 20, through page 10, line 12).

Accordingly, the Applicants submit that Wada and Nakatsugawa, considered individually or in combination, do not render obvious the subject matter now defined by claim 1. Independent claims 9 and 10 similarly recite the above-mentioned subject matter distinguishing apparatus claim 1 from the applied references, but claim 9 does so with respect to a method.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejections applied to claims 2-4 and 6-8 are overcome and allowance of claims 1, 9, and 10 and all claims dependent therefrom is warranted.

Claim 7 now recites searching a recorded entry and constructing a routing header to which knowledge related to the network topology on the periphery of the mobile node is reflected; the claimed feature supports improving packet delivery. Narten and La Porta disclose utilizing a routing header, but neither discloses the claimed feature of improving packet delivery by constructing a routing header to which knowledge related to the network topology is reflected. Wada, Nakatsugawa, Pannell, and Inoue do not supplement the teachings of Narten and La Porta in this regard. Therefore, allowance of claim 7 is warranted for this independent reason.

Claim 8 now recites that when a destination of the received packet or a last entry of a routing header is not a valid address in a local network or the destination of the packet is a care-of-address of a network element apparatus and the routing header is not added, the received packet is estimated to be abnormal and discarded. On the other hand, La Porta discloses comparing a care-of-address list of a foreign agent with the address of a received packet, and, when the address of the received packet does not exist in the care-of-address list, dropping the packet. However, La Porta does not disclose checking whether or not the last entry of a routing header is a valid address in a local network. Wada and Nakatsugawa do not supplement the teachings of La Porta in this regard. Therefore, allowance of claim 8 is warranted for this independent reason.

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

If any issues remain which may best be resolved through a telephone communication, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at the local Washington, D.C. telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/James Edward Ledbetter/

Date: April 15, 2008
JEL/DWW/att

James E. Ledbetter
Registration No. 28,732

Attorney Docket No. 009289-05123
Dickinson Wright PLLC
1901 L Street, NW, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036
Telephone: (202) 659-6960
Facsimile: (202) 659-1559